

2 January 1959

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chairman, CIA Career Council

SUBJECT: Training Evaluation Reports

1. Though OTR regulations specify that student performance evaluations will be prepared in conjunction with certain OTR conducted training courses, I do not believe that the principle of training evaluations as an Agency personnel management tool has ever been discussed at the level of the Career Council.

2. Training evaluations serve two main purposes: they provide OTR management with data from which we can determine what the students have learned, i.e., how good or bad the instruction is, i.e., whether OTR is successfully meeting course objectives. Training Evaluation reporting on individual student performance is the second aspect of the problem. OTR will continue to evaluate its teaching effectiveness and continue to require detailed and meaningful training evaluation reports on JOT performance in training courses. However, it is the extent, format and procedures of training evaluation reporting of non OTR students on which I seek the advice of the Career Council.

3. Training evaluation reporting is intrinsically an unpopular enterprise. No one likes to be evaluated, especially for the record. The longer the service, and the older the person, the more active the resentment. I keep hearing of attempts to avoid training courses because the training evaluation report becomes a matter of record. I hear this more frequently regarding operational courses where statements may be made about personal characteristics observed during the course. Also, it is argued that training evaluation information sent to supervisors is liable to misinterpretation, with injustice to individual careers.

4. To reduce the ground for complaints about training evaluation reports, the Office of Training takes a number of steps. First, prior to a course, it makes available information to supervisors about persons who indicate likelihood of failure. Second, the Assessment and Evaluation Staff has encouraged conferences with supervisors to help clarify the significance of particular reports. Third, reports for certain courses now have two parts: one describing how well the student met the course objectives and second containing instructors' observations and judgments. This second part is treated as an assessment report, being sent to the supervisor on an "Eyes Only" basis and returned to the A&E files. Finally, to provide a context for interpretation, a report has an introductory statement of the course's objectives, scope, length, and teaching methods. (See attachments for examples of evaluation reports.)

~~SECRET~~

SUBJECT: Training Evaluation Reports

5. Guidance is requested from the Career Council as to the policy that should be followed in reporting evaluation information to officials outside the Office of Training, e.g., supervisors and the Office of Personnel. Some of the questions which the Council will wish to consider in advising on this policy are:

- a. Should there be a differentiation in reporting made in terms of GS level, age of student, and length of time in the Agency?
- b. Should evaluation comments on personality characteristics be avoided for individuals who attend operational courses only for familiarization purposes?
- c. Should the decision as to the type of evaluation to be submitted on the individual be entirely up to the student's immediate supervisor, rather than to OTR? Thus, the responsible supervisor could choose one from several reporting categories which would be listed on the training application form, e.g., no report; report on student progress by adjectival grades; evaluation type comments on personality characteristics, etc.
- d. Should there be no report to the supervisor, but the information accumulated in the Office of Training to be available when needed by responsible authority?

MATTHEW BAIRD
Director of Training

Enclosures:
Attachments A&B